From:	David Keith
To:	Leos, Valmichael; Leos, Valmichael; Miller, Garyg; Foster, Anne; Sanchez, Carlos
Cc:	Phil Slowiak; Chris Torell; Teri Freitas; Sonja A. Inglin (singlin@bakerlaw.com); John Cermak; Steve Ginski; Andrew Shafer
Subject:	RE: Supplemental EPA questions for USACE Cap Review
Date:	Friday, May 10, 2013 9:55:02 AM
Attachments:	image001.png

Thanks Valmichael – We will incorporate these and include them in our response back to you along with the previously provided questions.

From: Leos, Valmichael [mailto:Leos.Valmichael@epa.gov]
Sent: Friday, May 10, 2013 9:51 AM
To: Valmichael Leos; David Keith; Miller, Garyg; Foster, Anne; Sanchez, Carlos
Cc: Phil Slowiak; Chris Torell; Teri Freitas; Sonja A. Inglin (singlin@bakerlaw.com); John Cermak; Steve Ginski; Andrew Shafer
Subject: Supplemental EPA questions for USACE Cap Review

David,

Per our conversation on the conference call yesterday. Please add these three questions to the list needing a formal written response to EPA.

Supplemental Data/Information Call

2g. What is the measured or estimated D_{30} for the B/C armor material?

1. The 2-D EFDC model runs with vertically averaged velocities will underestimate local shear stress in areas with these steeper slopes because the speeds are greater due to the vertical component. How does the design approach account for the higher vertical velocities and turbulence along face of the slope than modeled in EFDC due to limitations in the grid resolution to represent the actual slope or account for vertical velocities? The model represents the maximum slope as approximately 1V:10H while the actual slope is 1V:2H or greater.

2. The reassessment of the west berm analyzed the stability of the armor layer for wave runup and overtopping using techniques from the USACE Coastal Engineering Manual, but did not analyze the stability for sustained flow up and over the west berm. Bottom shear stresses from sustained flow were estimate from the EFDC model runs. The 2-D EFDC model runs with vertical averaged velocities does not include wave effects, which can be sizable for shallow water as along the crest and upper portion of the berm. When the western cell is inundated under extreme flow events such as the 25-yr and 100-yr events and high flow velocities are predicted to occur along and over the west berm, how are the bottom shear stress computed to incorporate the shear stress induced by orbital velocities from waves? Or how does the design approach account for the higher vertical velocities and turbulence along face of the slope induced by waves?

Federal On-Scene Coordinator (OSC)
1445 Ross Ave (6SF-PE)
Dallas, Texas 75202
Leos.valmichael@epa.gov

214.665.2283 * *fax 214.665.2278*

From: Leos, Valmichael
Sent: Thursday, April 25, 2013 4:01 PM
To: 'David Keith'; Miller, Garyg; Foster, Anne; Sanchez, Carlos
Cc: Phil Slowiak; Jennifer Sampson; Chris Torell; Teri Freitas; Sonja A. Inglin (singlin@bakerlaw.com); John Cermak; Steve Ginski
Subject: EPA questions for USACE Cap Review

David,

Please find attached questions that the EPA is requesting the respondents for the San Jacinto River Waste Pits superfund site answer that will be helpful to the US Army Corps of Engineers in finalizing the TCRA cap review report.

I will follow up with a official letter in mail containing these questions by the end of next week.

Sincerely,

Valmichael Leos
Federal On-Scene Coordinator (OSC)
1445 Ross Ave (6SF-PE)
Dallas, Texas 75202
Leos.valmichael@epa.gov

214.665.2283 * *fax 214.665.2278*

From: David Keith [mailto:dkeith@anchorqea.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 04, 2013 9:40 AM
To: Miller, Garyg; Leos, Valmichael
Cc: Phil Slowiak; Jennifer Sampson; Chris Torell; Teri Freitas; Sonja A. Inglin (singlin@bakerlaw.com); John Cermak; Steve Ginski
Subject: Draft Groundwater SAP Addendum - San Jacinto River Waste Pits Superfund Site

Gary – On behalf of International Paper, Company (IPC), we are submitting the attached draft Groundwater Sampling and Analysis Plan Addendum 2 (SAP Addendum) to address the additional investigation requested by USEPA in regards to groundwater in the vicinity of Soil Investigation Area 4. It continues to be IPC's position that only COIs listed in Table 5 of the Sediment SAP (Integral and Anchor QEA 2010b) should be analyzed in additional soil and groundwater samples taken in the area of investigation south of I-10, because only these COIs are potentially attributable to any disposal of paper mill waste in the 1960s. Analysis of soil and groundwater for a full suite of VOCs and SVOCs, and analysis of soil and sediment samples for total PCBs, is unwarranted; however, as requested by USEPA, analysis of the samples for the full suite of VOCs and SVOCs and

for total PCBs is provided for in the attached SAP Addendum.

Please don't hesitate to contact me if you would like to discuss anything during your review of this document. Hard copies are being sent by overnight delivery. Please forward the attached PDF as appropriate.

Thank you,
David

David Keith, Ph.D., P.G., C.Hg.
Anchor QEA, LLC
614 Magnolia Avenue
Ocean Springs, MS 39564

Phone: 228-818-9626
Cell: 228-224-2983
dkeith@anchorqea.com

ANCHOR QEA, LLC
www.anchorqea.com